

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7                   **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
8                   **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**  
9

10 BRUCE WOLF,

11                 Plaintiff(s),

12 v.

13 CLARK COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF  
14 FAMILY SERVICES, et al.,

15                 Defendant(s).

Case No.: 2:17-cv-02084-JCM-NJK

**Order**

(Docket No. 100)

16         Pending before the Court is Plaintiffs' renewed motion for leave to file exhibits under seal.  
17 Docket No. 100. Plaintiffs submit that Docket Nos. 88-1 and 88-3 should be sealed to maintain  
18 the confidentiality of information regarding Plaintiffs pursuant to the protective order at Docket  
19 No. 44, the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act ("HIPPA"), Nevada Revised  
20 Statute 432B.280, and "the law of this case." *Id.* at 2-4. The renewed motion is defective for  
21 numerous reasons.

22         First, Plaintiffs fail to provide a meaningfully developed argument as to how HIPPA  
23 applies to the exhibits at issue. *See Kor Media Group, LLC v. Green*, 294 F.R.D. 579, 582 n.3 (D.  
24 Nev. 2013) (courts only address arguments that are meaningfully developed). Second, Plaintiffs  
25 inaccurately represent that the protective order entered by this Court requires the filing of any  
26 documents the parties deem confidential under seal. Docket No. 100 at 2. The protective order  
27 has no such requirement. *See* Docket No. 44. Moreover, the Court has specifically stated that  
28 protective orders merely "facilitate discovery exchanges," and do not "establish sufficient grounds

1 to seal a filed document.” Docket No. 45. Lastly, Plaintiffs fail to state whether the documents  
2 they request to be sealed could be redacted, and if so, which portions of which documents. *See*  
3 *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1137 (9th Cir. 2003); *see also In re Roman*  
4 *Catholic Archbishop of Portland in Oregon*, 661 F.3d 417, 425 (9th Cir. 2011) (the district court  
5 must “keep in mind the possibility of redacting the sensitive material”).

6 Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** without prejudice Plaintiffs’ renewed motion for leave to  
7 file exhibits under seal. Docket No. 100. The Court **ORDERS** Plaintiffs to file a second renewed  
8 motion no later than August 6, 2018. The Court **INSTRUCTS** the Clerk’s Office to maintain  
9 Docket Nos. 88-1 and 88-3 under seal pending the Court’s ruling on that motion.

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 Dated: August 1, 2018

12 \_\_\_\_\_  
13 NANCY J. KOPPE  
14 \_\_\_\_\_  
15 United States Magistrate Judge  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28